

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary  
Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting**

Wednesday, November 10, 1999  
8:30 A.M. – 4:30 P.M.  
Marine Center Classroom (upstairs)  
125 Harbor Way Santa Barbara, California

**Draft Meeting Summary**

---

**In Attendance:**

Patricia Wolf, Chair  
Ed Cassano, Co-Chair  
Locky Brown  
Warner Chabot  
Marla Daily  
Gary Davis  
Robert Fletcher  
Craig Fusaro  
Dale Glanz  
Neil Guglielmo

Korie Johnson (Alt. for Mark Helvey)  
Deborah McArdle  
Michael McGinnis  
Merit McRae (Alt. for Tom Raftican)  
Chris Miller  
Steve Roberson  
Alicia Stratton

Michael Eng, Facilitator  
John Jostes, Facilitator

---

1. **Welcome and Introductions:** Co-Chairs Patty Wolf and Ed Cassano led the introductions and welcomed alternate members Korie Johnson and Merit McRae. Patty Wolf noted that the day's agenda would be challenging to complete because of the significance and complexity of the topics to be covered.
2. **Review of Agenda:** Facilitator John Jostes led the Working Group through a summary of the day's agenda, outlining what would be covered in the morning and afternoon sessions, and the time allocated to each item. He circulated a handout designed to facilitate the discussion of Working Group Timeframes, Process and Meeting Dates (Item # 5).
3. **Adoption of Meeting Summary from October 21, 1999 Working Group Meeting:** John Jostes led the group in a review of the meeting summary of its October meeting and entertained comments and suggestions from those in attendance. Craig Fusaro suggested the addition of wording to the discussion under item #7 to indicate that Sanctuary staff will return to the Working Group with a presentation on specific GIS Data Layers for a given cell/location at some appropriate point in the near future. It was suggested that the timing of such a presentation might coincide with presentations and joint discussions with the Science Panel in early 2000. Additional corrections were suggested to correct the reference to San Nicolas Island on page 4 of the notes. The changes were accepted by a consensus of the Working Group.
4. **Discussion and Adoption of Proposed Meeting Ground Rules:** The Facilitation Team led a discussion of the revised groundrules that were distributed to the Working Group in advance of the meeting, noting their importance as the foundation for having a productive dialogue on matters of substance facing the group in this and future meetings. Minor comments were made regarding consistent use of terms in reference to the final product of the Working Group. In addition, revisions were made with regard to footnoted material related to the mission statements of both the Science Panel and Socio-economic Team. Considerable discussion took place regarding the issue of interactions and contacts with the media in relation to an individual member's ability to interact with the media. It was noted that when stakeholders within and outside of the Working Group process have made public statements that are reflected by media coverage, Working Group members or their organizations may wish to respond to such coverage. In the interest of full disclosure and openness, it was also noted that the groundrules should not

inhibit a member from providing their own or their group's perspectives to the media. The Working Group added the following language to complete Section 10 of the Groundrules:

*"When in contact with the media about marine resources in the Channel Islands, members will, as a courtesy, provide notice to the Working Group about these contacts."*

With the changes noted above, the Working Group adopted the Groundrules as revised and directed the Facilitation Team to finalize and publish the groundrules in written and electronic format, posting it on the Website and distributing hard copies to the members, their alternates and other interested parties (e.g., Sanctuary Advisory Council, stakeholder organizations, etc.). The Working Group added that the media should be given an overall timeline and Working Group contact information.

- 5. Review of Overall Marine Reserve Working Group Timeline, Process Steps and Milestones:** John Jostes handed out copies of a one-page summary of meeting dates, topics and expected outcomes of the Working Group process through the anticipated completion date of June 2000. He explained that the timeline would serve as an "itinerary" of where the Working Group was going and how it would get there. Both he and Michael Eng briefed the group on the interrelationships among the meetings, action items and communication with the public, highlighting the importance of coordination with the Science Panel and the Socio-economic Team early in the process.

The facilitators also noted that the draft was an organic document that had been developed given the best available information at the moment and that depending upon progress of the group itself, and new information that becomes available, that topics and outcomes may shift and evolve to some degree. However, for planning purposes, the specific dates of meetings scheduled through March 2000 were proposed as firm dates. The facilitators also noted that the ambitious nature of the schedule. Several members of the Working Group echoed that view as well.

With regard to the evening public forum scheduled for January 20, 2000, it was suggested that that it be located in the Ventura area to maximize participation by stakeholders and interested public in Ventura County. In addition, members suggested that a discussion of implementation issues and administrative challenges be added to the February 23, 2000 meeting. With those refinements, the schedule was adopted by consensus of those present. The Facilitators were directed to make the appropriate changes and publish an updated version for distribution to the Science Panel, Socio-economic Team, Sanctuary Advisory Council and other interested parties.

- 6. Discussion of Fears and Apprehensions regarding Marine Reserves:** The remainder of the morning session was dedicated to individual presentations regarding the fears and apprehensions of Working Group members and their constituents about establishing marine reserves. John Jostes asked each member to share their underlying concerns about the process, science, socio-political context and real-world experiences that affected how they perceive marine reserves in the Channel Islands area. Members each took approximately five minutes to share their views with the group as a whole. Each presentation was followed by a question and answer session wherein others were encouraged to ask questions to gain clarification of the concerns presented. The presentations highlighted the concerns related to equity issues, precedential value, the role of science and politics, economic survival, insufficient size and reserve design, existing de-facto closures, external forces and past administrative failures. The following list is a representative sample of the fears and apprehensions raised:

- We're setting precedents
  - Lets do it right
  - How to integrate with other efforts?
- Need for adequate support for reserves - enforcement - compensation - evaluation
- Political decisions have already been made
- Additional restricted closed access from other processes (rockfish & lingcod)

- Poaching in closed areas due to inadequate enforcement
- Keeping everybody engaged in the process
- Shifting location of fishing pressures due to closures
- Large closure area of entire island may foreclose access in different weather conditions
- Closure of CINMS could significantly impact economical survival
- Existing kelp bed closures due to rocks, etc. and limits on harvest
- Putting human faces on those groups that will be impacted
- We're affecting "culture" by our decisions
- Reserves will be too small and scattered to be effective (during normal/extreme events) and to measure and sustain benefits
- Lost options for future generations
- No scientific consensus on best way to manage reserves (mostly based on individual's opinions & conclusions)
- Contamination of science with politics
- Resources (especially near shore) are in jeopardy
- How are fishermen going to survive with multiple closures in region and possibly more draconian future management measures?
- Process may be compromised if Working Group can't develop regulations to go along with science panel's recommendations
- What about "social contract" and commitment of agencies to be accountable to agreements
- How to include experiential knowledge into decision-making process?
- Too little, too late for some species
- Reserves will ultimately work only if there is user support
- In 2025, 50 million Californians will overwhelm marine resources regardless of what we do
- Process may forget that existing closures are de facto reserves
- Maritime "community" is endangered
  - Need to recognize the link between social system and ecological system
- Need to consider effects of ecological system outside CINMS boundaries
- Have we outreached to all affected communities will others undermine our efforts later on?
- Need to take long-term view
- No good examples of reserve networks
- Lack of information on which to base decisions
- Taking action given limitations in science
- Providing clarity on goals, objectives, issues and questions
- Public recognition of this process
- Losing sight that the resources are public

**7. Identification of Key Issues to be Addressed:** Michael Eng led the afternoon discussion of key issues by asking the members to consider: *"What key issues does the Working Group need to address in developing its recommendation regarding marine reserves in the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary?"..*

The Working Group broke into small clusters of 3-4 individuals, identified a series of five or six specific issues, and then classified them in terms of:

- Which issue is most readily apparent?
- Which issue can be most satisfactorily addressed?
- Which issue is the most challenging?
- Which issue could benefit the most from input by the Science Panel? and,

- Which issue could benefit the most from input by the Socio-economic Team?

Issues were then grouped through an interactive dialogue resulting in the following categories and sub-issues:

#### Status of Resources:

- How to effectively evaluate the health and status of marine resources and the ecosystems?
- Human-induced change versus natural variability
- Status of Resources
- Status and distribution of resources and habitats - prioritize
- Which species are in trouble?
- Are the fisheries healthy?

#### Socio-Ecological Balance

- Identification and synthesis of socio-economic and ecological characteristics
- Options for mitigating reserves
- Balance /socio-economic versus marine resources
- Equity Issues -- Shared Burden
- Social Values of Reserve Design
- How do we fairly allocate the risks and benefits among the users?
- How do you couple conserving marine resources with the livelihoods that depend upon them?
- Ecosystem sustainability and human sustainable use
- Sustaining Working Fishing Ports

#### Evaluation

- Scientific Monitoring
- How do we incorporate recognized failures in the past (existing reserves) into this process?

#### Goals and Objectives

- Biodiversity and/or Fish Reserves (purpose)
- Criteria or Goals of Reserve Design
- Must a Marine Reserve be totally "No Take"?

#### User Profiles

- How do we Quantify the Economic Interests in the Channel Islands
- Who are in the Universe of Resource Users (who's affected?)
- Where are the Activity Hot Spots? (Mapping)

#### Reserve Design

- What is the Appropriate Size and Configuration? (Duration)
- Size and Location of Reserves
- How many, How large, Where?
- Reserve Size
- Ecological Scale of Reserve Design (spatial and temporal)
- Area Selection? Relationship between currents, habitats, and dispersal?

#### Reserve Administration

- How do we deal with conflicting agency mandates?
- Administration of reserves
- Enforcement

Following the characterization of the key issues, Steven Roberson, Dale Glanz and Mike Murray were asked to individually chart the relationships among each of the categories of issues and be prepared to present an overview of their approach to the Working Group at the beginning of the next meeting.

## **8. Other Matters:**

- A. Designation of Alternates: John Jostes reported to the group that each Working Group member had identified their alternate(s). He requested that each member forward to him the full address, phone, fax and e-mail of those individuals and their preferred method of receiving information. He committed to updating the contact list for distribution to members at the next meeting or within the next meeting packet.
- B. Management Plan Update: Anne Walton of the Sanctuary Staff provided the Working Group with a brief overview of the Management Plan update process, noting that the Sanctuary initially conducted an internal review of the 1982 management plan and current work going on, and conducted a series of seven public Scoping Meetings followed by a public "Feed-back" meeting. She indicated that the target date for a completed management plan is December 2000. Additional public workshops will be held in January of 2000 to focus on and solicit input on specific issues facing the Sanctuary. Following those meetings, the environmental review will generate a draft EIS with a draft document due out in June of 2000. The remainder of the year 2000 will be spent finalizing the EIS to allow for its adoption in December. The entire process is public and progress on the management plan can be tracked on the Sanctuary website.
- C. Information Needs: The discussion of information needs centered around the need for the Science Panel and the Working Group to coordinate their efforts as soon as possible, so as to be ready for the joint, two-day meeting scheduled for January 10-11, 2000. Sanctuary staff noted that the Science Panel meeting originally scheduled for November 15<sup>th</sup> had been cancelled, awaiting feedback from the Working Group on Goals and Objectives, and questions related to information needs. The facilitators circulated a draft letter prepared by staff from the Working Group to the Science Panel that was developed to provide a "heads-up" to the panel regarding the planned workshops in January and February, and the expected products to be generated by the Working Group at its December meeting. Working Group members provided suggestions for staff to consider in revising the letter. The Working Group authorized, by consensus, the Co-chairs to sign and forward the letter to the Science Panel, to craft a similar letter for the Socio-economic Team, and to forward copies to the Sanctuary Advisory Council for information purposes.
- D. Announcements by Working Group Members: Craig Fusaro noted that the November issue of "FISHERIES" contained an article prepared by many of the noted scientists serving on the Science Panel and volunteered to share it with the group by providing copies to staff for duplication and distribution with the next meeting materials. The article is entitled "No-take Reserve Networks: Sustaining Fishery Populations and Marine Ecosystems".
- E. Other Matters:

Earlier in the meeting a suggestion was made that it would be valuable to initiate discussion of the administrative details of Marine Reserve implementation. It was noted that the recommendation developed by the Working Group should be cognizant of

administrative barriers, funding shortfalls and institutional coordination challenges that may be faced if Marine Reserves are proposed. Deborah McArdle was identified as a key resource to be consulted as this discussion evolves.

Discussion also took place regarding the desirability of providing Working Group members with copies of existing institutional and organizational goals and objectives related to marine reserves. It was noted that the information binder already contained some documentation from the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, California Fish and Game, Pacific Marine Fisheries Council, Assembly Bill 993 (Shelly). A request was made to other interests within the Working Group (fishermen, National Park Service, environmental organizations, etc.) to provide the group with their existing goals and objectives, in cases where they have been documented.

**9. Next Steps:** The Facilitators reviewed the action items and commitments made during the meeting (see attached sheet). It was suggested that the next meeting deal with the following matters of substance:

- Presentation by Steven Roberson, Dale Glanz and Michael McGinnis charting the relationships among key issue categories developed during the afternoon session of the November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Mutual Education about and Identification of Goals and Objectives for transmittal to Science Panel and Socio-Economic Team.
- Preliminary Listing of Questions for transmittal to Science Panel and Socio-Economic Team.
- Other matters of substance as suggested by the Facilitators, time permitting.
- Other "housekeeping" and procedural issues and updates, time permitting